

age, there is a substantial increase in the rate of infection as individuals enter their late teens and early 20s, with infection peaking in the mid to late 20s. Sustained, targeted prevention for each group entering young adulthood is what will keep these waves from developing.

Behavioral science has also shown that a balance of prevention messages is important for young people, and that total abstinence from sexual activity is the only sure way to prevent sexual transmission of HIV infection. Despite all of the efforts, some young people may still engage in sexual intercourse that puts them at risk for HIV and other STDs. For these individuals, the correct and consistent use of latex condoms has been shown to be highly effective in preventing the transmission of HIV and other STDs.

How important does the gentleman think it is for older, and I would not necessarily say that all the Members of Alpha Phi Alpha are old, but more mature members of our society to share concepts, ideas and experiences with younger people, as this project kind of attempts to do, in steering them in a more appropriate direction? And would the gentleman have any challenge for other groups and organizations as to how they can be more helpful?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I think the gentleman's question really answers itself. The course in Project Alpha, and I have participated in many of the activities at the national convention and in classes in Project Alpha in my own home community in Virginia, and they teach responsibility, they teach abstinence, they teach safe sex; and it is done in such a way that they have the role models from the community coming in and explaining the importance of avoiding teen pregnancy and avoiding the sexually transmitted diseases.

These kinds of role models, I think, can show that they do have a future. One of the high risk factors of getting into trouble is when young people do not feel that they have a future. They tend to involve themselves in more risky behaviors because they think they have nothing to lose. When they see role models and can see a path, particularly a continuum of role models, some of the older ones, like the gentleman, and younger ones, like me, and even younger ones, they can see that they have a future within their life. They see that there are jobs available and careers available. And to the extent that they involve themselves in risky behaviors, they place that future at risk.

So we challenge other groups to get involved in the same kinds of interaction with our young people, because we can have a significant impact in keeping them out of trouble to begin with and keeping them on the right track, and that is why Project Alpha is so important.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Let me just thank the gentleman for his response and for his participation. People throw out accolades, and sometimes they are meaningful and sometimes not as meaningful; but when it comes to role modeling, I would certainly think that the gentleman has been and continues to be one, not only as a Member of Congress but also in the community where the gentleman lives and works. So I want to thank the gentleman for coming and for sharing with us this afternoon.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman as well, and I would want to point out that the gentleman himself has been a stalwart advocate of civil rights and voting rights. Just yesterday, we had a special order involving voting rights and the importance of voting, and my fellow fraternity brother has been one of the leaders in that effort.

I want to congratulate the gentleman on his leadership. He has a long history of public service, going back to local government in Chicago, and that certainly shows that the gentleman is a role model and an Alpha that everyone can be proud of.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Well, I thank the gentleman. As we have discussed this afternoon and we have pointed out, all of our speakers have, the impact of HIV and AIDS in the African American community, we know that it has indeed been devastating. As a matter of fact, through December of 1998, the Center for Disease Control had received reports of 688,200 AIDS cases. And of those, 251,408 cases occurred among African Americans. Representing only an estimated 12 percent of the total United States population, African Americans make up almost 37 percent of all AIDS cases reported in this country.

Researchers estimate that 240,000 to 325,000 African Americans, about one in 50 African American men and one in 160 African American women, are infected with HIV. Of those infected with HIV, it is estimated that more than 106,000 African Americans are living with AIDS. So when we see a program like Project Alpha, there is no doubt about its importance in mentoring, educating and encouraging young adults to be responsible during their teen years and beyond.

According to the CDC, 10 national studies have shown that education programs increase safer sex practices among young people who are sexually active. These programs also lead to abstinence, fewer sexual partners, and increased and more effective use of contraception among young men and women.

The other major objective of Project Alpha is teen pregnancy reduction from a male perspective. And although teen birth rates experienced a decline between 1991 and 1996 across all ethnic and economic groups, the country is

beginning to see a new surge in pregnant women under 20 years of age. Some important facts to consider are: the United States has the highest pregnancy rate of all developed countries. About 1 million teenagers become pregnant each year, of which 95 percent are unintended. Public cost as a result totaled \$120 billion between 1985 and 1990, a circumstance that may resume if current trends continue. It is estimated that \$48 billion could have been saved if birth had been postponed.

Eleven States are implementing comprehensive integrated youth programs to prevent teen pregnancies. While others have assistance programs, the Department of Health and Human Services' recent annual report reveals that 32 States have no specified goals regarding this issue. However, Project Alpha has vision with long-range benefits: to reduce teenage pregnancy, thereby reducing child poverty; reducing high school dropout rates and boosting the probability that young adults can fully achieve their potential.

Furthermore, realizing that these programs are traditionally targeted towards raising awareness in young women, Project Alpha focuses on reaching young men, an important yet often overlooked factor in the teen pregnancy problem. By educating young men about contraception and emphasizing personal responsibility, positive changes in attitude and behavior can make a positive difference.

Finally, again, I would like to congratulate Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity and the March of Dimes for recognizing the need for Project Alpha and holding a week that not only serves young Americans in our communities nationwide, but also fulfills the alpha pledge: First of All, Servant of All. Does the gentleman have any other comments?

Mr. SCOTT. I would just like to thank the March of Dimes and Project Alpha for providing this guidance to our young citizens, and I thank the gentleman for organizing this special order.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman once again, and First of All, Servant of All, we shall transcend all.

#### REPUBLICAN PLAN FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what I would like to do is to take a few minutes this afternoon and to begin a discussion with those Members who have been a part of what we have been doing with economic development, a plan by the Republican Party, House and Senate. This plan gives us an opportunity

to lead this country into further economic development, an opportunity to develop not only the plans that we have had for quite some time on moving this country forward by stopping the deficit spending that has gone on, but also to turn the country to where we are able to look at ourselves and what we want in the future of this country so that we have economic development and prosperity in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first talk to what this Congress began doing in 1995, after the election that took place in 1994 where we signed the Contract With America. Back in 1994, when the Republicans began the effort we called the Contract With America, we started this plan and idea, which I signed on to because I believed, as my Republican colleagues did, that it was a comprehensive way for us to begin the discussion about how we change the power structure from Washington, D.C. to move power back home; how we go about balancing the budget and still maintaining economic prosperity and, lastly, how we take the power that is in Washington and empower people back home to begin making their own decisions.

□ 1430

We knew in 1994, just as we do today, that money equals power, probably always has and probably always will, and that the people who have the money are the people that are the decision makers and they are the people that will control, many times, the destiny.

Yet we understood that, back in 1994, the estimates were that this Congress, the Congress that was a Democratic Congress at that time, would continue not only spending every single penny that came to Washington, D.C., but they would also take that money and spend more than what we had. That was called deficit spending, creating a debt that would be long-term on this country. And in 1994, by and large, we had a debt in this country of \$5.5 trillion.

The Contract with America, which has been the baseline document for Republicans and this Congress to move forward on, has become really a contract with America that would lead to the development of where we are today.

What happened as a result of that was that two different times this Republican Congress, understanding that welfare was a huge issue in this country, people on welfare needed to come and join what was going on not only in workplaces but would also be a better relationship that they would have with their families to go and create opportunities for those families, many times having a job where they had not had them in generations, and so what happened was we changed the dynamics by changing the law.

What happened in that entire endeavor was we all of a sudden created eco-

nomics opportunity. Instead of some seven million people being on welfare today, as they were back before 1996, there are now seven million people who get up every morning and leave their home and go to work. They go to work and they become taxpayers. They have become credible people that we can look at and say they have made our country better. Many times they may be doormen or cooks, they may be drivers, they may be involved in teaching our children. But they are people who have made a significant gain in their own personal life and for the life of our Nation.

We are now at the point where these seven million people have created opportunities, because they are now taxpayers, to become a part of paying into what this country has with its system, Social Security, Medicare, the opportunity to pay school taxes, to have a strong voice because they now feel a greater responsibility, and they have been empowered to become a part of what we are doing.

What has happened is that this Republican Congress went from 1996 to 1997 and we had a package, an economic development package, it was called a tax cut package also, and we understood as conservatives that we would incent America to begin the process of wanting to not only invest in jobs and opportunities but also to invest in our stock market and the critical mass that was necessary to begin our infrastructure capitals, and we did this by first cutting taxes. It was a following up with what happened with us having our welfare changes. And we cut taxes. We cut the capital gains tax.

Of course there were people that did not want us to do that. The tax collectors that were in Washington, D.C., said, we should not do that. That will ruin our deficit. We were told it would cost the tax collector \$9 billion. In fact, what it did is it brought in \$90 billion. It was the catalyst for this country completely turning around to where we all of a sudden then had a surplus.

For, you see, if you do not have a surplus, you cannot pay off your debts. What it did is it changed the direction to where we quit spending money on welfare and started spending more on education and on the infrastructure of this country.

Point two: We looked at families and said, you are the most important asset America has; and we created what was then called a \$500 per-child tax credit. It has been nothing less than marvelous to see my neighbors and friends who want to take care of their own family who now have a chance to get back their hard-earned money so that they can take care of their own children.

Point three: We raised the exemption on what is called the death tax, estate tax. We looked at who was being hurt

and we compromised with the President and said, we need to raise the exemption.

We went immediately to farmers, people who own their only property for agriculture, and we raised the exemption. We changed this because we believed then and believe now that the people who own their own land and agriculture, for the people that own their own small businesses who, yes, may have assets and resources but are cash poor, should not, based upon death, have these assets taxed to the point to where their heirs have to sell the farm, sell the small business and break it up simply to pay the tax collector.

These are the things that we did to bring us to the point where we are in America where we have created a surplus. We now have breathing room. We now know and are prepared as a Congress to move forward with the new President, a new President that has a bold plan about how we are going to not only make America sound by paying down the debt but by creating economic opportunity for the future.

I am pleased to be joined today by my good friend, the majority leader of the United States Congress, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY). The gentleman from Texas has been a leader in the efforts to make sure that the plans that will develop America to where people get back more money in their pocket to where they have the power will be a key to our future because he is not only majority leader but he is also a grandfather and he recognizes that the future of this country rests with our grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) on this matter.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for taking this hour so that we can conduct this discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I think we in America ought to recognize our heroes, we ought to recognize the people that help this Nation prosper and do well.

There is no doubt in my mind that this Nation owes a debt of gratitude to Bill and Al. Bill and Al can rightfully be cited as the people that perhaps more than anybody else has made it possible for this Nation to be as prosperous as it is.

More than any other two people, perhaps these two people, Bill and Al, are the people that we can credit for all the jobs, the prosperous economy, the fact that the Federal Government is running a surplus, the fact that that surplus combined with the fiscal restraint we have shown here in the House of Representatives has allowed us just on last Saturday to have paid down an astonishing, an astonishing \$350 billion in debt in the last 3 fiscal years.

Bill and Al, Mr. Speaker, have done so much more than any other two people I can think ever to warrant our applause and our appreciation for what they have done to make all this possible.

So I would like this body to join me to give a special thank you to Bill and Al, Bill Gates and Alan Greenspan. Without their hard work, we could not have prospered the way we have done.

That is not necessarily the voice that you will hear out of the campaign, Mr. Speaker. The Vice President is running for President, and the essence of his message is, this prosperity is the best idea I ever had. He is saying, without myself and the President, we could never have had this prosperity; and if you do not elect me President, you may lose your prosperity.

It is a frightening thought, Mr. Speaker. When I listen to these speeches on the campaign trail and I realize that the argument that I am hearing is that, the President and I gave you the prosperity and if you lose us, you will lose the prosperity, I am haunted by this fear that on Tuesday we will win the election and I will wake up on Wednesday and discover the Internet has gone away.

But let us look at this. The Vice President says, my plan will secure the prosperity, my plan will preserve the surplus, my plan will continue to buy down debt and save Social Security.

We have taken the trouble to look at the Vice President's plan. And, Mr. Speaker, the Vice President is putting out an economic plan that would spend the on-budget surplus. Indeed he would not only spend all of the on-budget surplus, and this is what I refer to in common parlance as the income tax surplus, but he would even return us to those frightening days of yesteryear when this Government continuously raided the Social Security, and under the Vice President's plan, should he get elected and implement his plan, we would not only spend all of the income tax surplus, but he would go back to the days of raiding the Social Security trust fund and spending those monies, as well.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SESSIONS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

The reason I am here is that, with two distinguished Texans having taken the floor, I think it is important to provide a little geographic perspective to this debate.

The fact of the matter is my geographic perspective comes from California and the area which I am privileged to represent, Los Angeles, which happened to be the site of the Democratic National Convention.

At the Staples Center, we saw the Vice President deliver a speech in

which he unveiled about 37 different programs which, based on the studies we found, would cost a projected \$2.3 trillion. And so, my friend is right on target when he talks about the fact that when we look at where it is we are going and the things that have been proposed, we are going back to a dramatic level of spending.

In fact, I have argued that if, God forbid, AL GORE were to be elected President of the United States, there are many people, certainly on our side of the aisle, who might look back and think, my gosh, would it not be wonderful if we had the days of Bill Clinton again. Because we know that it has been President Clinton who has embraced the 1997 balanced budget agreement, putting us on the road towards balancing the budget not through the tax increase, much of which has been repealed in 1993 that he put through and which Vice President GORE was the deciding vote on in the United States Senate when they voted to do things like have a \$48 billion cut in Medicare that was included in that package that they are so proud of, and at the same time we saw the President embrace our tax reduction effort in 1997.

He has embraced the traditional Republican themes of free trade, and we are very proud that he joined with us in doing a number of free trade things; and, of course, the welfare reform bill, which, as we all have said time and time again, he twice vetoed and ultimately signed.

My point is that those bipartisan accomplishments which President Clinton has joined us on, would I believe in large part be reversed with many of the programs that my friend is referring to that have been unveiled by the Vice President.

I think it is very important for the American people to know that, while people have said that the moniker of tax and spend which traditionally had been put around the necks of Democrats in the past and we Republicans have so often said tax-and-spend Democrats, it has been not as easy to do that over the past few years since President Clinton joined with us in a number of initiatives, but if we look at this proposal which has come forward from Vice President GORE, tax and spend would be an understatement for the pattern that we would have.

I wonder if my friend would agree with that.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, yes, I would. I must say, if the gentleman from Texas will continue to yield to us, my colleague says the Vice President today embraces the welfare reform and he embraces the budget agreement we reached in 1997.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I said the President did.

Mr. ARMEY. The President did.

The fact of the matter is part of the story that the Vice President does not

tell us is that he did in fact vote in 1993 for President Clinton's budget, that budget that increased taxes, a larger increase in taxes than any other time in the history of the world, increased taxes on gasoline, increased taxes on Social Security benefits, increased taxes across the Nation.

□ 1445

Then in 1997, in fact, he vehemently objected to our budget agreement where we reduced taxes and set us on the course to a balanced budget. The clear fact of the matter is that if you took the Congressional Budget Office and the Office of Management and Budget at the White House, the projections that they made in 1994 for where we would be this fiscal year under the President's 1993 budget, that budget for which the Vice President so consistently claims credit by virtue of having cast the tie-breaking vote in the Senate, that under that budget had it continued, we would have had a \$264 billion deficit this year. Now, that was not my projection. That was the projection made by the President's own Office of Management and Budget, which was agreed to by the Congressional Budget Office.

It was only after 1995, 1996, and especially 1997 where we made this enormous change in direction in the budget that we began to see the projections change; and, indeed, rather than a \$264 billion deficit that was projected for this year under the President's 1993 budget, today, thanks to the 1997 budget, the welfare reform and the other things that we did, we have an actual surplus of \$250 billion. From \$268 billion in deficit to \$250 billion of actual surplus is a half a trillion dollars' worth of budget turnaround.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that point, I think it is important for us to note that with that \$264 billion projected deficit, it pales in comparison to the projected spending level that we would see under these plans that have been unveiled by Vice President GORE. I think that is one of the most troubling things. As bad as those proposals were projecting a \$264 billion deficit, they look wonderful, and almost like a surplus, compared to what has been put before us as far as projected spending.

Mr. ARMEY. The gentleman is absolutely right. I am reminded of that wonderful song by another very important and colorful Californian, Merle Haggard, "Rainbow Stew," where Merle Haggard bemoans the American fear that Presidents will go through the White House door and not do what they said they would do. In the case of the Vice President's budget proposal, I think, Mr. and Mrs. America, our fear should be that this President would go through the White House door and do what he said he would do.

We all look at Bill Clinton, and we think of him as a big spender; but when

you think of President Clinton as a big spender, you have got to recognize that as a big spender, he is a piker next to Vice President AL GORE and his plans. Vice President AL GORE wants \$3 for new government spending programs compared to every \$1 in new programs requested by President Clinton. That is what I call an awful lot of risky, big government spending schemes.

Vice President GORE's spending proposals add up to at least \$2.7 trillion in new Federal spending over the next 10 years. This is important for us to understand: he would spend the entire projected on-budget surplus to pay for his massive expansion of government. That is not what he said the other night. He said the other night he is going to preserve the surplus. But the fact is if he got his way on the spending proposal that he is campaigning on, he would spend the entire income tax surplus.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is interesting that what took place the other night with the discussion of what the Vice President said, and he looks right at the camera and says it. Yet he looked at the camera and talked about him being in our home State a year ago when we were having natural disasters and then admitted a day later, well, he was not there at all. He told us a story about the school where the girl who is the daughter of the restaurateur did not even have a desk to sit at. Yet the reason why, we now find out, after the fact, that 100 new computers were being delivered to the school that day and her desk was taken to put a computer on it.

Which person can we trust? I would suggest to you it is the numbers that you have talked about that is his real plan and the real effects that it will have.

Mr. ARMEY. That is what we are trying to do here. For example, one of the other things we discover when we look at the plan proposed by Vice President GORE is that for every dollar by which he would cut taxes, and I might mention, that would be a net tax cut because he has in fact more actual tax increases than he has tax reductions in his budget plan, but for every net dollar of tax reduction, he would raise government spending by \$6.75.

His spending spree would not stop there. His plan would also spend from the Social Security trust fund. We stopped the raid on Social Security, and we will not go back.

Mr. Speaker, I think there is a fact we should recognize here. I think it is a telling statistical comparison. If we take the period of time from 1980 to 1990, the United States people sent to this government a doubling of the money they sent because of the economic growth that followed in the first couple of years of the Reagan administration in 1981 and 1982.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield, that was due to one measure. It

was the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981, which Ronald Reagan pushed for and was able to get ultimately some southern Democrats and some of your Texas colleagues to vote in favor of. That laid the groundwork for a doubling of that flow of revenues to the Treasury through the decade of the 1980s.

Mr. ARMEY. Through the decade of the 1980s. This incidentally is labeled by the Vice President and his friends as "the decade of greed," where also incidentally you had charitable giving not only double but charitable giving to faith-based institutions triple during this period of time. The American people did a magnificent job. They not only built more, created more jobs, earned more, paid more in taxes; but they doubled what they gave to charities and tripled what they gave to faith-based charities. Yet they have the audacity to look at you and me and our families back home and indict us as having lived a decade of greed.

We doubled what we sent to Washington. Bless us. What did Washington do with it? Washington increased spending by \$1.68 for every increased dollar we sent them. It does not take any genius to figure this one out. Any time you increase the money coming in by a dollar and increase the money going out by \$1.68, you are going to run a deficit. That is what we did. That deficit was so large that it not only spent all of the Social Security trust fund surpluses we generated in those areas, up to \$60, \$70, \$80 billion a year; but it ran a \$250 billion deficit.

Let me just say, since 1994, after we put in the massive restructuring of what we call entitlement or mandatory spending, that spending that could never be touched by any President but it was required by Congress to restructure the actual spending programs, welfare reform being the most applauded incident of such reform, that has put 4 million people to work that up to that point had lived in the hopeless despair of welfare. But since that period of time, for every increased dollar the American people have sent in to Washington, spending has gone up by less than 50 cents. Once again, it does not take a genius to figure that one out. If you have got an increased dollar coming out and you are spending out less than 50 cents, you are running a surplus.

That surplus was the product of two things: the prosperity of the American people, the job creation, the expansion, the invention that we see in this magnificent electronic revolution that we are surrounded by in America, the increased tax bonus that came to Washington because America was doing well; and a first time in my lifetime restraint of government spending by a responsible Congress that did the one thing that everybody by that time knew was imperative, reformed the in-

stitutionalized, mandatory government spending programs that had been constructed through all that period of time beginning in the mid-1960s called the Great Society programs of President Johnson, and added to quite often by, and most often by, Members of this body.

Mr. DREIER. If the gentleman will yield on that point, when I heard him mention the Great Society, I was reminded of an analysis that I heard of the programs that have been put forward by the Vice President, and an independent analyst, I frankly have to admit I do not remember which one it was, I was either reading the newspaper or I may have listened to it on National Public Radio, they came on and talked about how these proposals which have come forward from the Vice President actually match, or in some cases even exceed, the level of spending that we saw launched as the Great Society.

We do know full well that the spending on subventions that we saw launched with the Great Society were in excess of \$5.2 trillion, as Speaker HASTERT likes to say, with a T, that is trillion with a T, \$5.2 trillion in spending; and we saw during that period of time the poverty level in this country go from 14.7 percent to 15.2 percent. And so that pattern has clearly failed. And we all know very well that it has failed around the world, as we have seen people clawing toward self-determination.

We are watching the situation unfold at this moment in Belgrade where hundreds of thousands of people are storming to have self-determination because they feel that their votes were improperly counted there. The rest of the world is moving towards individual initiative, responsibility, self-determination, and the proposals that have come forward from Vice President GORE shift us back to the failed policies of the Great Society. That is something that I think again the American people need to know and it is an extraordinarily troubling situation.

Mr. ARMEY. I want to ask the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), we all watched this debate the other night and we are always impressed with glib politicians. People who can turn a phrase impress us. I always like a wordsmith. But every time I see one of these politicians that can come along and so slickly recite expressions, phrases, numbers, I always have to stop and ask myself, can that fellow really be trusted with words and numbers?

One of the things the Vice President made a big point of the other night was that if you elect me, we will never, ever, ever touch your Social Security trust funds. Now, first of all they have got a bad track record on that. But we take a look again at his budget proposals. And his very own proposals

when you score them out, they estimate that the Vice President would rob the trust fund of between \$500 billion and \$900 billion to pay for his new spending agenda.

Mr. and Mrs. America, we are today celebrating the fact that we have made \$350 billion in debt reduction; and here we have got a fellow that has come along and said, "I'm going to spend between \$500 billion and \$900 billion to pay for my new programs."

Mr. SESSIONS. I think the gentleman is right. What is interesting is that I felt like that there should have been some tracer along the bottom about truth in advertising, because, in fact, what happened is that the Vice President made it seem like that he would support these lockboxes that would be available for Social Security and Medicare; and yet it is the Vice President's own party, the Senate minority leader TOM DASCHLE, that will not allow seniors today to be able to have their own lockbox for Social Security. And yet we are supposed to trust the Vice President to say if he were only President, he would accomplish what he cannot get done or President Clinton cannot get done today. Truth in advertising should be important.

Mr. ARMEY. Yes, it should. Here is another case in point. The gentleman from California will recognize this distinguished professor from Stanford University, Dr. John Cogan. The Vice President says his plan would cost \$200 billion over 10 years. We have already seen that the estimates are that it would rob the trust fund of between \$500 billion and \$900 billion. The Vice President says it would cost only \$200 billion over the next years. Let us not take my word for it. Let us not take his word for it. Perhaps I might be perceived as one of those glib politicians, such a good wordsmith. How about Dr. John Cogan of Stanford University. He says that the Vice President's plan would cost \$160 billion in the very first year alone. Yet the Vice President says that it would be \$200 billion over 10 years.

Again, you have got to have an objective measure of these numbers. Ladies and gentlemen, be very, very careful when somebody says, "I'm from Washington; I'm here to help you. Trust me, I'm from the government." I think it is better to get a second opinion and a second opinion from the professor from Stanford would be helpful here.

□ 1500

Mr. DREIER. I am going to give a second opinion, but it is my opinion of what Professor Cogan had to say on the issue of tax reduction. My friend, another Dallas friend of mine here, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), just handed me a clip from the editorial page of the "Wall Street Journal."

First, I see we are joined by another gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL).

Mr. SESSIONS. All conservatives.

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to have the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) joining us. Let me say as we look at where we stand on this tax proposal, the thing that was very, very troubling was this argument that, of course, every bit of benefit goes to the richest 1 percent of the American people. We continue to have that argument put forward.

Professor Cogan has really blown the top right off of that argument, as was pointed out, in this piece in the Journal the day before yesterday, in which it talks about the fact that people at the lowest end of economic spectrum are those that have the greatest percentage reduction.

I guess if you look at the fact that there are people who make large amounts of money and maybe pay \$500,000, \$1 million in taxes, you have got to ask if someone does pay \$500,000 in taxes, as Michael Reagan posed last night on his radio program when I was talking to him, are they not entitled to some type of reduction? Well, under the plan that Governor Bush has put forward, they would get about a 10 percent reduction in their tax burden.

Yet those who are earning less than \$35,000 a year get how much, based on this assessment that Professor Cogan has put forward? A 100 percent reduction. Why? Because if you couple the doubling of the child tax credit from \$500 to \$1,000, along with the overall rate reduction, it is very, very clear that those who are earning less than \$35,000 are the greatest percentage beneficiaries from this program that has been put forward by Governor Bush.

Again, that has not gotten out there, but Professor Cogan very correctly points to that, those who are in the upper-income levels have the lowest percentage reduction. But it does seem to me that the argument that we have been getting for the past several months on this us-versus-them class warfare, that is why I think George Bush is right on target when he describes himself as a uniter and not a divider.

I have oft quoted our former colleague, the late Senator Paul Tsongas, who said it so well. He said, "The problem with my Democratic Party is that they love employees, but they hate employers." So that has created a situation where we do not recognize what my friend from Dallas, Texas (Mr. ARMEY) has just mentioned, where the people in, for example, the technology sector of the economy, 45 percent of our Nation's gross domestic product growth in the past 3 years has come from these job creators.

Yes, there are a lot of very rich people, and I know my friend opened by talking about Bill and AL. Bill Gates is one of them, who has been very suc-

cessful financially. But look at what he has created in jobs, in improving the quality of life and standard of living, not only here in the United States, but around the world. So they are tremendous beneficiaries of this successful man, who has had the incentive to try and look at creative ways to deal with challenges that are out there. And these proposals, which would be so divisive, that the Vice President has put forward, would do little more than stifle that kind of creativity. I find it very troubling.

Mr. HALL of Texas. If the gentleman would yield, does the gentleman remember when it was indicated that a George McKinney, who was a friend of the Vice President, had to go to Canada, as a \$25,000 a year man, had to go to Canada to get satisfaction in the health field. I just wondered, who sent him up there for the last 8 years? I think a real good answer would have been, you know, 8½ years is long enough for that to happen. If they put the right folks in position and then charge up here, he will not have to go to Canada; he can go to his corner drugstore.

Mr. SESSIONS. Reclaiming my time, there has been a good question that has been thrown on the floor, and certainly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), a man of great stature and also with grandchildren at home, as I looked at just in being the father of two little boys, I heard AL GORE talk about the top 1 percent. He was running against success in America, people who are successful, people who obviously have made so much money that, by golly, we should run against them.

In fact, I have always taught as a parent, as a scoutmaster, and even as an employer and certainly in my congressional district, we want and need people who will come and work hard. Yes, they will be rewarded for what they do, but expect them to give back to their community.

Bill Gates, incredible amounts of money that he has given for learning projects, for opportunity to employ people, and yet what do we hear? We hear Vice President GORE attack Bill Gates, attack the top 1 percent.

It is a philosophy that then flows directly to the Attorney General of the United States, who, rather than trying to encourage competition, goes and beats up the largest, most value-packed company in the world, that has created millions of jobs.

Since that time, it is the Attorney General and her actions of government that have put the economy at risk. It is the high-tech companies that today are worried about their profits, that are worried about it.

Of course, the question that came from Mr. Lehrer was about the world economy. I believe the answer is it is the United States Government and AL GORE, through the policies and procedures because they do not like people

to be rich, they do not want people to be successful, for envy reasons, that would destroy what we have built up in this country.

Mr. ARMEY. Maybe the gentleman from Texas might make a point. I would like to come back to that point too.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the majority leader and the gentleman from Dallas. Everybody, from a young man like Calvin Clyde from Tyler, Texas, who sits by my side, to people past my age, are a little sick of pitting class against class. I think that is old stock. I do not think it sets well. I think the American people can see through that.

Mr. ARMEY. I want to talk about this 1 percent. I am getting tired of hearing it. When we tried to do the \$500 per child tax credit, they said that is for the top 1 percent richest people of America. Give me a break on that. I raised five children. I never felt rich at any time when one of those babies came along. I perhaps had blessings beyond my wildest dreams in all five of them, but I do not remember feeling rich.

We said, well, we will eliminate the marriage penalty. They came back and said, that is a tax break for your rich friends. Again, come on, how many young people getting married feel rich? They may feel blessed, but, bless their hearts, they do not feel rich. If they do get married, why stick them with a \$1,400 tax penalty? I laugh at our Tax Code. It just tickles me.

We have got a generous, although constantly eroding, home mortgage deduction to encourage us to buy a house, and then we have got a marriage penalty to encourage us to live in it out of wedlock. The government cannot make up their mind as to what they want to do in their social engineering. But that top 1 percent, this has become a mantra. No matter what tax reduction you talk about, it gets the same indictment.

Here is the real story. The real story of the debate is whose money is it? If I reduce taxes, I thereby will take less of your money. It is your money. But how is it characterized? As me having a big tax giveaway.

I cannot give away what is not mine to give. It is your money. And that is the fundamental message. Why is it if they take 90 percent of the budget surplus and we commit to buying down debt, and then take from that 10 percent that remains the essential spending for a lot of our emergencies, like the fires and floods you have been seeing, to restore our military readiness so our children will be safe on the job as they defend liberty here and abroad, a few of the other things, and then say another 5 percent of it we give back in taxes, or just refuse to take it away in taxes, why is that going to blow a hole in the budget when you have got, by alternative, a spending proposal that is

\$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years? Why is it they always say, when I spend more of your money, that is good for the economy; but if I leave you to spend more of your money, that is bad for the economy?

Let me just finish my point. In the end, whether I spend the money or the government spends the money, the acid test is, am I getting what I need for myself and my family?

Now, the Vice President, he presumes he knows better. He thinks he can, through the government, buy better for me and my family than I can. My response to that is, oh, yeah? When was the last time you got your wife the right birthday present? I cannot even figure it out for my wife, who I know better than any other person in the world and love more than all other people in the world. And I cannot get the right birthday present. Why does somebody in Washington think they can do a better job for my wife than I can, or, for that matter, for me? The audacity of that just amazes me.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the majority leader for being here today, and I will tell the gentleman that I believe his time as a professor of economics not only pays often, has paid off in the past, but will pay off in the future. It is a matter of freedom. It is a matter of freedom about who is going to make decisions for who.

One of the things which we as conservatives repeatedly speak about is that we believe it is not only our money, but it should be our decision-making process also. I think it really gets back to this question of who is going to make the decisions for us. It is either going to be the tax collector or the taxpayer. And money still equals power, and the opportunity to have money in your pocket means that you cannot only engage in the debate and be a part of what is happening, but you can have a say in the final answer. And when Washington, D.C. gets all the money, which is what AL GORE wants, then they will be the decision maker in life.

If we give the money back to the taxpayer, which is what George Bush and the Republican Party wants, then we will have an opportunity for people to not only come and participate in America, but for their answer to be the winning answer, their dream to be the big-dream.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. I appreciate the gentleman having this special order. I have been absolutely fascinated with some of the claims I see being made by our liberal Democrat brethren, and one of them is that the big thing now is to attack our tax cut plan, because we are giving a tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. Of course, they never point out those are the Americans who paid a lot of the taxes, and, in

fact, I believe the figures are that the top 5 percent of taxpayers paid a majority of the income taxes in this country.

So it is really Marxist class warfare, is what it is. In fact, I do not like to use the term "middle class," and I hear Vice President GORE use that term over and over and over again. It is a Marxist term. You will never find in the U.S. Constitution any reference to "class." In fact, it says all men are created equal. It is the very opposite of this idea of classes that are to be pitted against each other, somehow using government to redistribute benefits from one to go to the other.

I was absolutely fascinated to hear the attack levied recently by the Vice President on Republicans, and specifically Governor Bush, over this 1 percent, over giving the tax cut to all Americans, including the 1 percent of the wealthiest, and yet he then turns around and attacks the Republicans for not giving free prescription drugs to the top 1 percent of wealthiest Americans.

Figure that one out. If that is not the height of hypocrisy and nonsense, I do not know what is. His socialistic disastrous plan for prescription drugs would destroy the surplus that we have worked so hard in the 6 years of Republican administration of this Congress to build up. He would create just another huge entitlement program that would result pretty much in government price fixing, and the drug industry would drop innovation and would be giving all these free prescription drugs to people who do not need them, and all the time he is telling us what a great fiscal conservative he is.

Mr. SESSIONS. It is interesting that the facts of what George Bush's own tax plan is all about was in the "Wall Street Journal," a review of it, on September 5 of this year. Here is what it does. I quote from this article. "The Bush tax cut does not favor the rich."

The "Wall Street Journal" says, "The Bush tax cut does not favor the rich. This is not a flat tax, or even a proportional cut, though such cuts would be more efficient in economic terms. Rather, higher income families get lower percentage reductions."

□ 1515

This is household income. Those earning \$50,000 to \$75,000 a year would see an average cut of 30 percent. My colleagues, I will tell you that this is exactly in line with what our economics have been, to take the burden away from people who earn between \$50,000 and \$75,000. Families earning \$75,000 to \$100,000 would see an average cut of 18 percent, and those earning more than \$100,000 would have an average reduction of 10 percent.

Mr. Speaker, what this does very clearly is say that where you have two people, perhaps they are both teachers

making \$35,000 and \$35,000, they would receive a cut of 30 percent.

All the time in my district, wherever I go, I try and talk about how teachers are great for not only our schools and our children, but for America; and they talk about they want a pay raise, they need more money, they need more money. The George Bush tax plan would give the average teacher and a spouse a 30 percent tax cut.

I cannot imagine any school board giving their teachers a 30 percent tax increase. We need to have a tax cut. This government is too big and costs too much money. We need to give the power back, yes, even to our own teachers.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY).

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Texas also makes a point, you have to define your terms. What is a tax cut? George Bush suggests, like most of us would and the common sense parlance, that a tax cut is a reduced tax bill to those people who pay taxes. Is not that what most Americans would think?

Vice President GORE has one scheme here where he asks the IRS to actually write checks to people who do not even pay taxes, and he calls that a tax cut. Now, I call that a spending spree. It seems to me that there is a very definitional thing.

Can you imagine when the Vice President talks about his tax cuts that what is featured in there is this risky scheme where he is going to say to the IRS, you write checks to people who do not even pay taxes, and we will call it a tax cut. I would not call it that at all. I would call that a funds distribution.

Mr. Speaker, I pay taxes. The IRS has taken my tax money and given it to somebody else, but they are certainly not reducing anybody's taxes in the process. Let us start with making a fundamental thing. A tax cut should be, by definition, a reduction in the tax liability of somebody who pays a tax. Is that not a fair definition?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the gentleman. I would agree with that.

Mr. ARMEY. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) is here with us.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to add to this discussion the following thought: clearly, Governor Bush made the case, I thought very persuasively, and the choice between Vice President AL GORE and what Governor Bush comes down to is will we be a freer society in which the men and women who produce the assets and resources of our country get to decide how to allocate those assets and resources, or will it be a less free society and we will see the Federal Government's massive new powers, massive new spending that the

Vice President has proposed and believes in?

I would just like to make two observations. First, if we believe in the very central premise on which our Nation was founded, the principle of individual liability, then that is a very compelling reason in and of itself to support Governor Bush, because he wants to expand the freedom of the men and women of our country. But if we are not persuaded by that principle, then I would suggest that we ask ourselves, what does the empirical evidence suggest? What does the data suggest about the results of economic freedom?

The fact is, the jury is in, the verdict is in. The outcome is very, very clear. Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my colleagues that they might want to read an annual report that is produced by the Heritage Foundation in cooperation with the Wall Street Journal, and it is a fascinating report. What it does, it measures the extent to which various societies around the world are economically free.

It measures things such as the level of government expenditures in an economy, the level of the tax burden, the amount of the regulatory burden, whether or not currencies are exchangeable. It takes this measurement, and it evaluates those countries which are essentially free economies, and it analyzes those which are essentially unfree, and then it shows an astonishing interesting correlation between economic freedom and wealth and prosperity.

In fact, I would suggest my colleagues turn to page 21 of this report, it is the 2000 Index of Economic Freedom by the Heritage Foundation and Wall Street Journal, and what it demonstrates is empirically and objectively beyond a dispute that those economies, those societies that are most free are also most prosperous, allow their people to create the most wealth, have the highest standard of living, and the greatest opportunity in the world. And those societies which are least free have the greatest poverty and misery.

We know that that happens on the extremes. We know that the Soviet Union was an economic disaster, and the United States has been an economic miracle, but the important point that this study illustrates is that it is not only true on the extremes, but it is true on the continuum in between.

Mr. Speaker, just to finish and to conclude, the point that it makes is that if we move in the direction of greater economic freedom, lowering the tax burden, lowering government regulation, limiting Federal spending, limiting the control of our society in the hands of politicians and bureaucrats in Washington, if we limit that and we expand personal freedom and economic freedom, we will have more prosperity, more economic growth,

more opportunity, more people with bigger take-home paychecks able to do the things that work best for their families; and that is the society that I think we all want.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY). The gentleman hits right to the point, and that is, we want to be in an America where we have opportunity and faith in each other and faith in our future.

I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), to talk about the surplus dollars.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Committee on the Budget, and we work very closely at taking a look at whose numbers add up, what we are going to do with the Federal budget surplus. I have here an apples-to-apples comparison of the Bush plan for the surplus and the Gore plan for the surplus.

I think it is very important to put aside all the rhetoric you hear, because a lot of times when you listen to politicians' rhetoric, when you listen to the presidential campaign rhetoric or the media's interpretation of the rhetoric, you do not actually see what is being proposed. Let us take a look at what is actually being proposed.

We have a monumental chance, a historic opportunity to use this surplus to address the many challenges facing our Nation. We have a chance to pay off our national debt. We have a chance to shore up Social Security. We have a chance to modernize and fix Medicare, and we have a chance to let people keep more of their hard-earned money as they continue to overpay their taxes.

What the Gore plan does is it says for every dollar coming into the Federal Government in the form of a budget surplus for the next 10 years, we are going to take 46 cents out of that surplus dollar, 46 cents out of every surplus dollar will go toward Washington, will go toward new spending.

Mr. Speaker, 36 cents of every surplus dollar will go towards Social Security and Medicare and paying down the debt. You take a look at the Gore plan, he has said in his speech and I notice in the debate we are going to pay off the debt by 2012.

The Bush plans the debt off even faster. It puts more money towards preserving Social Security and Medicare and paying off the debt. It puts 58 cents of every surplus dollar toward paying off the debt, preserving Social Security and Medicare.

The point is, if my colleagues take a look at the blue slice of this pie in the Bush plan, after paying off the debt, after stopping the raid on Social Security, paying off the debt in 12 years, after having a meaningful prescription drug benefit, people are still going to



be overpaying their taxes, and Governor Bush is proposing that 29 cents of every surplus dollar go back to the people who gave us the surplus, the taxpayers.

What is the alternative to that vision? It is not paying down debt. It is not a question of cutting taxes or paying off debt. It is a question of after paying off the debt and shoring up Social Security and Medicare, giving people their money back or spending it on new programs in Washington, which is what the Vice President is proposing.

He is proposing a minor 7 cents out of every surplus dollar going back to the taxpayers who gave us the surplus in the first place and a whopping 46 cents of new spending out of every surplus dollar. So the question that the Vice President has answered, is, it is not a question of paying off debt, it is a question of not giving anybody their money back or spending more money on new programs in Washington.

If my colleagues take a look at the amount of spending, Bush wants to spend \$278 billion over the next 10 years above and beyond the current budgets for national defense, for education, for fixing Medicare. GORE wants to increase spending by \$2.1 trillion. He is proposing the largest spending increase in 35 years to double the size of the Federal Government in 10 years. That is the proposal you see with the Gore budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a huge election. This is about philosophy and vision. The question is, do you want your money to come to Washington and to stay in Washington, so that Washington then can give you some of your money back if you engage in behavior that they approve of; or do you want to keep some more of your own money in your paycheck to begin with? Do you want us to become fiscally responsible and pay off our debts before we launch into new spending sprees and creating more programs?

These are the questions that are being answered that are going to be on line in the ballot this November between Bush and Gore.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), who has orchestrated this hour and thank him for the time he has given.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN). I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and also the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader. We have had an opportunity today to speak about the differences between what is AL GORE's old tax and scheme plans versus confidence and security that we will make sure that people make their own decisions back at home which is called the George Bush plan.

I want to thank my colleagues for not only participating today, but for

the fervency of their belief that America's greatest days lie ahead of us; that I believe that America's greatest days and no problem that cannot be solved in America, because America will be responsible for its own destiny and the future, not the government.

#### ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to come to the floor this afternoon, and I hope to talk about the issue that I usually come on Tuesday to talk about but was preempted by the presidential debates on Tuesday night, that is, the problem of illegal narcotics and the damage that illegal narcotics have done across our land.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but come to the floor, though, preceding my colleagues who just spoke about some of the differences and the great balance that we have that may be undone here in this next election and some of the differences between the candidates on the issues.

I sat with many of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and watched the debates. There are some things I would have mentioned that were not mentioned. Governor Bush has not been part of the legislative process here. The governor was chief executive of the State of Texas.

Mr. GORE has been a Member of the other body, and the differences are very dramatic. He served a number of years as a Member of Congress and finally as a Member of the other body, and it was interesting.

Before I get into the drug portion of my talk this afternoon, I want to talk about some of the differences that are very distinct, the failure of the Vice President, when he was a Member of Congress, to ever come forth with a balanced budget; the failure of Mr. GORE to ever come forward with a proposal to secure Social Security. He is talking about a lockbox.

□ 1530

The Republicans did a lockbox here. He is talking about paying down the deficit by 2012. We are talking about paying down the deficit sooner than that with the plan that we have.

There are things that he had an opportunity, but why did he not propose this? When the Democrats had control of both Houses of Congress, the Senate, by a wide margin, and this body here by a wide veto-proof margin, they could do basically anything they wanted to do. What did they do? He said, well, I cast the deciding vote for an economic policy.

Well, Mr. Speaker, his plan was to pass a deciding vote to increase taxes

to the highest level they had. The plan that they brought to this floor of the House of Representatives in 1993 when they passed that huge tax increase projected, their projections were a \$200 billion deficit this year. That would have been on top of raiding social security, which they had done decade after decade when they controlled this body.

What a farce, to have this side and one of the leaders of the other side come before the American people and tell them that he is going to solve the problem if he is given another chance.

He had a chance in the Congress, he had a chance when they controlled this place for 2 years with a wide, wide margin. What did they do? They taxed and they spent the largest tax increase.

Talk about energy policy, they do not have a clue of an energy policy. They have allowed the United States of America to be held hostage by ten dictators and by Middle East sheiks and others and allowed our reliance from around 50 percent on foreign oil to go now into the 56 percent and growing range. So we are held hostage. That is their policy.

What is amazing is that we are being held hostage by people in the Middle East, we who sent, under President Bush, our young men and women to die for them, and they cannot even negotiate an oil deal to give us a better rate on the per barrel oil price.

They do not have a clue of an energy policy. On our side of the aisle, we have all backed a domestic plan and tried to increase domestic production, tried to get alternative fuels. I have been up to the ANWR region of Alaska. The footprint that they had and the technology they had years ago when they took oil out of Prudhoe Bay, and even taking oil out of Prudhoe Bay, it is not the same technology today that it was 20 years ago. There is a very small imprint and footprint for oil production.

There is no reason why we have to be energy dependent. We can put a man on the moon. And there is no reason why we cannot devise technology for nuclear energy. Some countries produce much, much more of their energy supply by nuclear means. They do not want to talk about that, of course. But there is no reason why we cannot do away with nuclear waste and turn that actually into energy production. There is no reason why we should be held hostage. Under this administration, we have increased our dependency to foreign sources.

Those are some of the things that I noticed in the debate.

They talk about a tax cut and balancing the budget without hurting people. We heard the other side here, as we attempted to balance the budget. Balancing the budget is something they could have done for 40 years here. All they had to do was match the expenditures with the revenues. It is not a complicated thing. Most Americans do